

Application No.: 10/791,410

Docket No.: JCLA12158-R

**REMARKS****Present Status of the Application**

The Office Action dated 06/01/2007 has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-10 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (US 2003/0124773) in view of Kobayashi (US 7,180,546). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (US 2003/0124773) in view of Kobayashi (US 7,180,546) in view of Yamazaki (US 2004/0079941).

In addition, claims 11-12 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the bas claim and any intervening claims. In particular, the office action stated the prior art does not teach a camera module as claimed wherein a first flexible circuit board is electrically connected to the signal processing device and a second flexible circuit is connected to the image sensing device. While the use of flexible circuit boards for connecting image processing and image sensing devices is known in the art, the use of a first and second flexible circuit board as claimed is not taught or suggested.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 17 with addition of the limitation of "a first flexible circuit board is electrically connected to the signal processing device and a second flexible circuit is connected to the image sensing device". Applicant has also added the allowable subject matter of claim 11 into claim 8. Because the office action pointed out the prior art does not teach a camera module as claimed wherein a first flexible circuit board is electrically connected to the signal processing device and a second flexible circuit is connected to the image sensing device, the independent claims 1, 8 and 17 including the limitation of "wherein a first flexible circuit

Application No.: 10/791,410

Docket No.: JCLA12158-R

board is electrically connected to the signal processing device and a second flexible circuit is connected to the image sensing device" should be allowed. Moreover, since independent claims 1, 8 and 17 patently define over the prior art references and should be allowed, their dependent claims 2, 5-7, 9-10, 12-16 and 18-19 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date: 9-3-2008

4 Venture, Suite 250  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Tel.: (949) 660-0761  
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,  
J.C. PATENTS

  
Jiawei Huang  
Registration No. 43,330